

U.S. Serial No. 10/571,044  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2011  
Amendment dated: December 20, 2011

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 and 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicants' presently claimed invention as now specified. More specifically, Applicants note that the present invention is directed to an improved back light for a liquid crystal display device wherein a diffuser is disposed between the light source and liquid crystal display device.

Advantageously, the diffuser is comprised of a continuous body of a first resin material and diffusion elements wherein the diffusion elements are comprised of a second resin material that is different from the first resin material and the diffusion elements are located within the continuous body of the first resin material and being completely surrounded and encapsulated by portions of the first resin material. Additionally, a light distribution layer having a prismatic surface faces toward the liquid crystal display device and is comprised of a further body of resin material that is applied directly on the first resin material and the further body of resin material is an extrusion that is formed simultaneously adjacent to the diffusion structure.

Applicants respectfully submit that the references of record cited and relied upon by the Examiner fail to either teach or suggest the unique and advantageous features of the present invention detailed above and set forth in the independent claims of the instant application. More specifically, Applicants note that even the Examiner has acknowledged the deficiencies of the various references relied upon by the Examiner in support of the most recent claim rejections. For example, Applicants note that the Examiner has acknowledged that the primary Rika reference does not describe the diffusion elements having a portion of

U.S. Serial No. 10/571,044  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2011  
Amendment dated: December 20, 2011

the first resin material located at a light incident portion of the first resin material located at a light emission side. In recognition of this acknowledged deficiency, the Examiner relies upon the alternate Wang reference.

Significantly, however, the combination of Rika and Wang do not describe or suggest that there is a further body of material that is applied directly on the diffuser and the further body is an extrusion formed adjacent to the diffuser as disclosed and claimed in the instant application. Applicants further point out that the specified structure advantageously provides a convenient light distribution mechanism for improving the display characteristics of the liquid crystal display device while eliminating unnecessary structures of the prior art.

Applicants respectfully submit that the various references of record cited by the Examiner failed to either teach or suggest this unique and advantageous structure. Applicants further point out that the Examiner has acknowledged that the combination of Rika, Wang, and Campbell does not disclose or suggest that the extrusion is a multilayer extrusion comprised of a plurality of resin materials. The Examiner then asserts that the teachings of Yagi overcome this further acknowledged deficiency.

Significantly, however, Applicants note that the Examiner has merely identified various structures in the prior art but has failed to provide any teach or suggestion or motivation to combine the various structures in a single display device having the compact structure described and claimed in the instant application. Applicants respect to admit that it is only the instant application which incorporates all of these unique and advantageous features in a single structure.

As noted in the instant application on page 9 in the first full paragraph, the conventional backlight structures employ a significant number of additional discrete components in order to achieve the desired light guiding performance. Accordingly, it is desirable to achieve a reduction in the number of display device components. As described

U.S. Serial No. 10/571,044  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2011  
Amendment dated: December 20, 2011

on page 12 of the instant application, in accordance with the present invention, the diffuser of the present invention is formed by integrally molding the diffusion layer and the light distribution layer. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references do not describe or suggest these unique and advantageous features of the present invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has merely identified structures in the prior art which individually incorporate certain structures of the claimed invention. Significantly, however, the references alone or in combination do not indicate or suggest that the structures should be incorporated in the unique and advantageous manner of the present invention.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3891.

Date:

12/20/2011

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Depke

ROSEY, DEPKE &amp; LYONS, LLC

Sears Tower, Suite 5450

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6806

Tel: (312) 277-2006

Attorney for Applicants

(Reg. 37,607)